

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

**Attorney Docket No.**

Applicant has appointed Osha-Liang LLP, which is associated with customer number 32615, to represent Applicant in this case. Accordingly, please change the attorney docket number to **03226/795001; SUN060205** and send future communications to the address associated with customer number **32615**. A revocation and substitution of power of attorney executed by the Applicant is forthcoming.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1-19 were pending in the referenced application. Claims 2-4, 12-13, and 18 have been cancelled by this reply without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, as of this reply, claims 1, 5-11, 14-17, and 19 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 11 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 11.

**Claim Amendments**

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to clarify the following: (i) each token is generated using at least two sub-tokens; (ii) each sub-token is generated using a policy instance; and (iii) each policy instance is generated using a license policy type and a user specific parameter. Further, dependent claims 5-10, 14-17 and 19 have been amended in view of the amendments to independent claims 1 and 11. Support for all of the aforementioned

amendments may be found, for example, on pages 6-10 of the referenced application. No new matter has been added by any of the aforementioned amendments.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,918,113 (“Patel”). Claims 2-4, 12-13, and 18 have been cancelled by this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot with respect to the cancelled claims. To the extent that this rejection applies to the pending amended claims, the rejection is respectfully requested.

As discussed above, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to clarify that: (i) each token is generated using at least two sub-tokens; (ii) each sub-token is generated using a policy instance; and (iii) each policy instance is generated using a license policy type and a user specific parameter. Thus, in order for a user to obtain a token to access a resource, the database must contain (or be able to obtain) the necessary policy instances. If one of the policy instances is not available, then the corresponding sub-token is not generated. Because the sub-token is not generated, the token cannot be generated and, accordingly, the user cannot access the resource.

The following is a brief example, which corresponds to examples on pages 9 and 10 of the referenced application, and is not intended to limit the scope of the claims of the referenced application. Consider a scenario in which the database includes a first license policy type and a second policy license type, where the first license policy type allows access for the month of March by time and the second policy type allows access to resource A by usage. Using the above two license policy types, assume that the user is to only have access to resource A in the month of March between 9:00am to 5:00pm and that each access cannot exceed 1 hour.

Using the above access rights and the license policy types, two policy instances are created: (i) a first policy instance for the month of March with a user specific parameter of

9:00am to 5:00pm and (ii) a second policy instance for resource A with a user specific parameter of 1 hour. Once the aforementioned policy instances are created, the license manager verifies the policy instances and, if verified, generates the corresponding sub-tokens. The generated sub-tokens are then combined to create a token, where the token is used to access the resource. The token monitor associated with the resource uses the token to initiate access to the resource. Further, the token monitor monitors the individual sub-tokens in the token and terminates access to the resource, if one of the sub-tokens expires (*i.e.*, is no longer valid) (*see, e.g.*, Referenced Application, pp. 9-10).

Turning to the rejection, for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. The Applicant respectfully asserts that Patel does not disclose all the limitations of the claimed invention.

Specifically, Patel discloses (i) sending a request, by a client, to a license server to access an application; (ii) determining, by the license server, whether the client can access the application; and (iii) sending an access token to the client, if the client can access the application. (*See* Patel, col. 8, ll. 57-67). With respect to the content and format of the access token, Patel discloses that the access token is encrypted and includes an expiration time (*see* Patel, col. 8, l. 57 – col. 9, l. 9).

However, aside from disclosing that an access token is generated if there is a valid license agreement and that the access token includes an expiration time, Patel does not disclose *how* the access token is generated. In particular, Patel is completely silent with respect to generating a token using license policy types, policy instances, and sub-tokens. Further, Patel is completely silent with respect to managing access to the resource using the sub-tokens.

In view of the above, amended independent claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Patel. Amended dependent claims 5-10, 14-17 and 19 are allowable over Patel for at least the same reasons as amended independent claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **New Claims**

New claims 20-22 have been added by this reply. Support for new claims 20-22 may be found, for example, on pages 8 and 11, of the referenced application. No new matter has been added by any of the aforementioned claims. Claims 20 and 21 depend from claim 1 and claim 22 depends from claim 11. As discussed above, amended independent claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Patel. Accordingly, claims 20-22 are also patentable over Patel for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to amended independent claims 1 and 11.


**Conclusion**

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/795001; SUN060205).

Dated: March 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By



Robert P. Lord

Registration No.: 46,479

OSHA · LIANG LLP

1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800

Houston, Texas 77010

(713) 228-8600

(713) 228-8778 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant